



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,901	04/02/2001	Gregory Burns	MS1-095USC4	2420

22801 7590 06/05/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

RYMAN, DANIEL J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2665

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/824,901

Applicant(s)

BURNS ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel J. Ryman

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 51-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 51-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. The Declaration filed on 21 March 2003 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Arango (USPN 5,732,078) and Payton (USPN 5,790,935) references.
2. Applicant states, in the Amendment, that the invention was reduced to practice when the parent application 08/703,487 was filed 26 August 1996 (page 6, lines 10-11 of Amendment). Applicant also states that the invention was conceived and reduced to practice in the United States prior to 16 January 1996 (page 1, lines 15-17 of Declaration). While evidence proving a reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the references would be sufficient to demonstrate prior invention (see §715.07 "Three Ways to Show Prior Invention"), since no evidence is provided to indicate the actual date of the reduction to practice, other than the filing date of the parent application, Examiner assumes that reduction to practice occurred after the effective dates of the references and therefore evidence of conception and diligence prior to the effective dates of the references is needed to prove prior invention.
3. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Arango (USPN 5,732,078) and Payton (USPN 5,790,935) references to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. As evidence of diligence, Applicant states in the Amendment that "Diligent efforts to reduce the invention to practice include an invention disclosure meeting conducted with Applicant's attorney February 7, 1996, a first draft of the application being completed April 2, 1996, and the application 08/703,487 being filed August 26, 1996." While these actions, if corroborating evidence is provided, would demonstrate diligence, none of these actions occurred prior to the

Art Unit: 2665

effective date of the references. In addition, the MPEP states "When alleging the conception or a reduction to practice occurred prior to the effective date of the reference, the dates in the oath or declaration may be the actual dates or, if the applicant or patent owner does not desire to disclose his or her actual dates, he or she may merely allege that the acts referred to occurred prior to a specific date. *However, the actual dates of acts relied on to establish diligence must be provided*" (emphasis added) (see §715.07 "Establishment of Dates"). The Declaration does not provide any evidence that diligent efforts to reduce the invention to practice were taken prior to the effective dates of the references. Rather, in the Declaration, the Applicant alleges conception and reduction to practice prior to the effective dates of the references, and offers, as evidence, a document without any dates to support the allegation. Due to the lack of evidence, Examiner is not persuaded that Applicant conceived the invention prior to the effective dates of the references.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 51-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payton (USPN 5,790,935) in view of Arango (USPN 5,732,078).

7. Regarding claim 51, Payton discloses a content provider comprising a storage system (34); a server (processor 46) connected to the storage system (34) to serve the content to a local service provider (28) which provides the content to multiple clients (32, 65); a network port (interface between server 24 and network 26) adapted for connection to a first network (network 30); and a transmitter (transmitter of server 24 for transmission to network 26) responsive to the server to transmit information over a second network (network 26) to the local provider (28). Payton possibly does not disclose transmitting the content over a second network to the local service provider where the second network provides additional bandwidth so that the content is served to the local service provider in an event that the content is not served via the first network within a designated time period. Arango teaches a system in which the content is transmitted over a second network (network 260) to the local service provider (access point 220) where the second network provides additional bandwidth so that the content can be transmitted to the local service provider in an event that the content is not served via the first network (network 230) within a designated time period (col. 7 lines 17-31 and col. 8 lines 59-61). Arango does this in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval (col. 8 lines

Art Unit: 2665

59-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the content over a second network which provides additional bandwidth in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval.

8. Regarding claim 52, referring to claim 51, Payton discloses a network port (interface between server 24 and network 26) which comprises a connector compatible with a wire-based communication network and a wireless transmitter (see the wireless transmitter of server 24) to transmit content over a wireless network (network 26).

9. Regarding claim 53, referring to claim 51, Payton discloses the server is further configured to serve the content to the local service provider (28) in response to requests from multiple clients (32, 65).

10. Regarding claim 54, referring to claim 51, Payton discloses the server is further configured to serve the content to at least one other local service provider (another provider 28) which provides content to multiple clients (there are more than one provider 28 in Payton's system).

11. Regarding claim 55, referring to claim 51, Payton discloses the server is further configured to serve the content to at least one other local service provider (another provider 28) which provides content to multiple clients (there are more than one provider 28 in Payton's system). Furthermore, the transmitter is also further configured to transmit information over the second network to the at least one other local service provider (the transmitter in Payton's system is also configured to transmit content over wireless network 26 to all local providers 28). Payton possibly does not disclose transmitting the content over the second network to the at least one other local service provider. Arango teaches a system in which the content is transmitted over a

Art Unit: 2665

second network (network 260) to a local service provider (access point 220) where the second network provides additional bandwidth so that the transmitter can serve the content to a local service provider in an event that the content is not served via the first network (network 230) within a designated time period (col. 7 lines 17-31 and col. 8 lines 59-61). Arango does this in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval (col. 8 lines 59-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the content over a second network in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval.

12. Regarding claim 56, referring to claim 51, Payton discloses that the first network is a high-speed, high-bandwidth network (26, col. 4 lines 45-47) and the second network is a broadcast satellite network (50, col. 5 lines 62-67).

13. Claims 57-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payton (USPN 5,790,935) in view of Arango (USPN 5,732,078) in further view of Liebowitz et al (USPN 5,757,784).

14. Regarding claim 57, Payton discloses a content provider comprising a storage system (34); a server (processor 46) connected to the storage system (34) to serve the content to a local service provider (28) which provides the content to multiple clients (32, 65); a high-speed, high-bandwidth network (26, col. 4 lines 45-47) to communicate the content from the server to the local service provider; and a broadcast satellite network (50, col. 5 lines 62-67) to communicate information to the local provider (28). Payton possibly does not disclose transmitting the content over the broadcast satellite network to the local service provider. Arango teaches a system in which the content is transmitted over a second, guaranteed bandwidth, network (network 260) to

Art Unit: 2665

the local service provider (access point 220) where this second network provides additional bandwidth so that the content can be transmitted to the local service provider (col. 7 lines 17-31 and col. 8 lines 59-61). Arango does this in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval (col. 8 lines 59-61). Even though Arango does not specify that the second system is a satellite system, satellite systems are well known guaranteed bandwidth systems, as is evidenced by Liebowitz (col. 1 lines 27-37 and col. 15 line 45-col. 16 line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the content over the broadcast satellite network in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval.

15. Regarding claim 58, referring to claim 57, Payton discloses a high-speed, high-bandwidth network (26, col. 4 lines 45-47) to communicate the content from the server to the local service provider; and a broadcast satellite network (50, col. 5 lines 62-67) to communicate information to the local provider (28). Payton possibly does not disclose having the satellite network include additional bandwidth to communicate the content from the server to the local service provider. Arango teaches a system in which the content is transmitted over a second network (network 260) to the local service provider (access point 220) where this second network provides additional bandwidth so the content can be transmitted to the local service provider (col. 7 lines 17-31 and col. 8 lines 59-61). Arango does this in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval (col. 8 lines 59-61). Even though Arango does not specify that the second system is a satellite system, satellite systems are well known guaranteed bandwidth systems, as is evidenced by Liebowitz (col. 1 lines 27-37 and col. 15 line 45-col. 16 line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the content

Art Unit: 2665

over the broadcast satellite network in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval.

16. Regarding claim 59, referring to claim 57, Payton discloses a high-speed, high-bandwidth network (26, col. 4 lines 45-47) to communicate the content from the server to the local service provider; and a broadcast satellite network (50, col. 5 lines 62-67) to communicate information to the local provider (28). Payton possibly does not disclose having the satellite network include additional bandwidth to communicate the content from the server to the local service provider in an event that the high-speed, high bandwidth network does not communicate the portion of the content within a designated time period. Arango teaches a system in which the content is transmitted over a second network (network 260) to the local service provider (access point 220) where this second network provides additional bandwidth so the content can be transmitted to the local service provider in an event that the content is not served via the first network (network 230) within a designated time period (col. 7 lines 17-31 and col. 8 lines 59-61). Arango does this in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval (col. 8 lines 59-61). Even though Arango does not specify that the second system is a satellite system, satellite systems are well known guaranteed bandwidth systems, as is evidenced by Liebowitz (col. 1 lines 27-37 and col. 15 line 45-col. 16 line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the content over a broadcast satellite network in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval.

17. Regarding claim 60, Payton discloses a high-speed, high-bandwidth network (26, col. 4 lines 45-47) to communicate the content from the server to the local service provider; and a broadcast satellite network (50, col. 5 lines 62-67) to communicate information to the local

Art Unit: 2665

provider (28). Payton possibly does not disclose having the server configured to serve a first portion of the content to a local service provider via the high-speed, high-bandwidth network, and serve a second portion of the content to the local service provider via the broadcast satellite network. Arango teaches a system in which the content is transmitted over a second network (network 260) to the local service provider (access point 220) where this second network provides additional bandwidth so the content can be transmitted to the local service provider in an event that the content is not served via the first network (network 230) within a designated time period (col. 7 lines 17-31 and col. 8 lines 59-61). Arango does this in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval (col. 8 lines 59-61). Even though Arango does not specify that the second system is a satellite system, satellite systems are well known guaranteed bandwidth systems, as is evidenced by Liebowitz (col. 1 lines 27-37 and col. 15 line 45-col. 16 line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the server configured to serve a first portion of the content to a local service provider via the high-speed, high-bandwidth network, and serve a second portion of the content to the local service provider via the broadcast satellite network in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval.

18. Regarding claim 61, referring to claim 57, Payton discloses the server is further configured to serve the content to the local service provider (28) in response to requests from multiple clients (32, 65).

19. Regarding claim 62, referring to claim 57, Payton discloses the server is further configured to serve the content to at least one other local service provider (another provider 28)

Art Unit: 2665

which provides content to multiple clients (there are more than one provider 28 in Payton's system).

20. Regarding claim 63, referring to claim 57, Payton discloses the server is further configured to serve the content to at least one other local service provider (another provider 28) which provides content to multiple clients (there are more than one provider 28 in Payton's system). Furthermore, the transmitter is also further configured to transmit information over the second network to the at least one other local service provider (the transmitter in Payton's system is also configured to transmit content over wireless network 26 to all local providers 28). Payton possibly does not disclose transmitting the content over the second network to the at least one other local service provider. Arango teaches a system in which the content is transmitted over a second network (network 260) to a local service provider (access point 220) where the second network provides additional bandwidth so that the transmitter can serve the content to a local service provider in an event that the content is not served via the first network (network 230) within a designated time period (col. 7 lines 17-31 and col. 8 lines 59-61). Arango does this in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval (col. 8 lines 59-61). Even though Arango does not specify that the second system is a satellite system, satellite systems are well known guaranteed bandwidth systems, as is evidenced by Liebowitz (col. 1 lines 27-37 and col. 15 line 45-col. 16 line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the content over a second network in order to ensure that time-sensitive data is delivered in an appropriate time interval.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (703)305-6970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:00-5:00 with every other Friday off.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (703)308-6602. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-6743 for regular communications and (703)308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Daniel J. Ryman  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2665

DJR

Daniel J. Ryman  
May 23, 2003



HUY D. VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600